	Case 1:05-cv-00026	Document 147	Filed 06/19/2006	Page F of L4E D Clerk District Court				
1 2		FO)	S DISTRICT COURT R THE ARIANA ISLANDS	JUN 1 9 2006 For The Northern Mariana Islands By(Deputy Clerk)				
3	mogration of the All Act	TT	CIVII ACTION	INO CV 05 0026				
4	TOSHIHIRO TAKAHASHI,) CIVIL ACTION NO. <u>CV 05-0026</u>)					
5	Plaintiff,	:)) CTDLUATED	CDECIAL HIDV VEDDICT				
6	VS.		STIPULATED SPECIAL JURY VERDICT FORM; ORDER THEREON					
7	MAEDA PACIFIC CORPO	ORATION,))					
8	Defendant.))					
9								
10								
11	<u>STIPULATION</u>							
12	The attached Special Jury Verdict Form is submitted to the Jury pursuant to a stipulation							
13	between the Plaintiff and Defendant.							
14	SO STIPULATED							
15			77.1					
16	Date: June 16, 200	6.	Victorino DLG	. Torres, Esq., Attorney for				
17			Plaintiff	1				
18	Date: June 16, 200	6.						
19	,		John D. Osborr Defendant	n, Esq. Attorney for				
20								
21	SO ORDERED.							
22			1. 1	7.				
23	Date: <u>6-19</u> -	-06.	Honorable Ale	Munson, Chief Judge				
24				,				
25	,							
26								
27	RECEIVE	ID						
28	JUN 1 6 2006	1						
	Clerk District Court The Northern Mariana Is	lands						

	Case 1:05-cv-00026 Docume	nt 147	Filed 06/19/2006	Page 2	2 of 4				
1 2		FOR	DISTRICT COUR THE RIANA ISLANDS						
3									
4	TOSHIHIRO TAKAHASHI,)	CIVIL ACTIO	N NO. <u>Cv</u>	05-0026				
5	Plaintiff,)							
6	vs.)	SPECIAL JUF	Y VERDI	CT FORM				
7	MAEDA PACIFIC CORPORATION,	,))							
8	Defendant.)							
9									
10									
11	We, the jury in the above entit	led action.	find the following	special ver	dict on the				
12	We, the jury in the above entitled action, find the following special verdict on the questions submitted to us by preponderance of the evidence:								
13	questions successed to us sy proponal		no ovidence.						
14									
	OUESTION NO. 1. Was the Defen	dont Mac	oda Pacific Cornor	estion neal	igant as allag	ed by			
15	QUESTION NO. 1: Was the Defen		_	ation negl	igent as alleg	ed by			
	QUESTION NO. 1: Was the Defen Plaintiff Toshi		nhashi?		igent as alleg	ed by			
15			_	or "No".		ed by			
15 16			nhashi? Answer "Yes"		igent as alleg No	ed by			
15 16 17	Plaintiff Toshi	hiro Taka	Answer "Yes" Answer:	or "No". Yes	No 				
15 16 17 18	Plaintiff Toshi If your answer to Question No	hiro Taka	Answer "Yes" Answer: Answer:	or "No". Yes —— is verdict for	No orm. STOP H				
15 16 17 18 19	Plaintiff Toshi If your answer to Question No If your answer to Question No	hiro Taka	Answer "Yes" Answer: Answer: Solution, sign and return the solution, then answer Que	or "No". Yes —— is verdict for stion No. 2	No orm. STOP H	ERE.			
15 16 17 18 19 20	Plaintiff Toshi If your answer to Question No If your answer to Question No QUESTION NO. 2: Was Defendan	hiro Taka o. 1 is "no" o. 1 is "yes at Maeda	Answer "Yes" Answer: Answer: Answer: The sign and return the The sign and return the The sign and componention The sign an	or "No". Yes —— is verdict for stion No. 2	No orm. STOP H	ERE.			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Plaintiff Toshi If your answer to Question No If your answer to Question No	hiro Taka o. 1 is "no" o. 1 is "yes at Maeda	Answer "Yes" Answer: Answer: S, sign and return the T, then answer Que Pacific Corporation Ty?	or "No". Yes —— is verdict for stion No. 2 on's neglige	No orm. STOP H	ERE.			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Plaintiff Toshi If your answer to Question No If your answer to Question No QUESTION NO. 2: Was Defendan	hiro Taka o. 1 is "no" o. 1 is "yes at Maeda	Answer "Yes" Answer: Answer: Answer: The sign and return the The sign and return the The sign and componention The sign an	or "No". Yes —— is verdict for stion No. 2 on's neglige	No orm. STOP H	ERE.			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Plaintiff Toshi If your answer to Question No If your answer to Question No QUESTION NO. 2: Was Defendan	hiro Taka o. 1 is "no" o. 1 is "yes at Maeda	Answer "Yes" Answer: Answer: S, sign and return the T, then answer Que Pacific Corporation Ty?	or "No". Yes —— is verdict for stion No. 2 on's neglige	No orm. STOP H	ERE.			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Plaintiff Toshi If your answer to Question No If your answer to Question No QUESTION NO. 2: Was Defendan	hiro Taka o. 1 is "no" o. 1 is "yes at Maeda	Answer "Yes" Answer: Answer: S, sign and return the T, then answer Que Pacific Corporation Ty?	or "No". Yes is verdict for stion No. 2 on's negligation or "No".	No orm. STOP H ence a proxin	ERE.			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Plaintiff Toshi If your answer to Question No If your answer to Question No QUESTION NO. 2: Was Defendan	hiro Taka 1 is "no" 1 is "yes 1 Maeda	Answer "Yes" Answer: Answer: Answer: Answer Que Corporation Answer "Yes" Answer:	or "No". Yes is verdict for stion No. 2 on's neglige or "No". Yes	No ———orm. STOP H . ence a proxim	ERE.			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	If your answer to Question No If your answer to Question No QUESTION NO. 2: Was Defendan cause of Plaint	hiro Taka 1 is "no" 1 is "yes 1 Maeda 1 iff's injur	Answer "Yes" Answer: , sign and return the , then answer Que Pacific Corporation y? Answer "Yes" Answer:	or "No". Yes is verdict for stion No. 2 on's negligor "No". Yes is verdict for service for the service for t	No Orm. STOP H Orm. No Orm. STOP H	ERE.			

Case 1:05-cv-00026 Document 147 Filed 06/19/2006 Page 3 of 4 QUESTION NO. 3: Was Plaintiff Toshihiro Takahashi contributorily negligent as alleged by 1 **Defendant Maeda Pacific Corporation?** 2 Answer "Yes" or "No". 3 Yes No 4 Answer: 5 If your answer to Question No. 3 is "no", do not answer Question Nos. 4 and 5. Instead, 6 proceed directly to Question No. 6. 7 If your answer to Question No. 3 is "yes", then answer Question No. 4. 8 9 QUESTION NO. 4: Was the contributory negligence of Plaintiff Toshihiro Takahashi a 10 proximate cause of his injury? 11 Answer "Yes" or "No". 12 Yes No 13 Answer: 14 If your answer to Question No. 4 is "no", do not answer Question No. 5. Instead, 15 proceed directly to Question No. 6. 16 If your answer to Question No. 4 is "yes", then answer Question No. 5. 17 18 QUESTION NO. 5: What percentage of 100% is due to the negligence of the Defendant 19 Maeda Pacific Corporation and what percentage of this 100% is due 20 to the contributory negligence of the Plaintiff Toshihiro Takahashi? 21 Your answer to both Plaintiff and Defendant must total 100%. 22 23 Negligence of Defendant Answer: % 24 Negligence of Plaintiff % 25 **TOTAL:** 100 26 27

28

QUESTION NO. 6: Without taking into consideration the reduction of damages due to the contributory negligence of the Plaintiff, if any, what do you find to be the total amount of damages, including economic and non-economic damages, if any, suffered by the Plaintiff caused by the accident involved herein? Answer: (a) Economic Damages (b) Non-Economic Damages TOTAL: DATE **FOREPERSON**

Filed 06/19/2006

Page 4 of 4